# UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

*Associate Editors*

Francis Neilson | Louis L. Mann | Curtis W. Reese

## Buried Alive

*By* M. C. OTTO

## Items From a Traveler's Note-Book

*By* JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

## Jew and Christian

*By* LOUIS L. MANN

## Europe and the Peace Pact

*By* HARRISON BROWN

VOLUME CII NUMBER 23

Chicago, February 18, 1929

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

# UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANCIS NEILSON LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY Fellowship

ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GAWTHRY, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. G. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROGERS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich, - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Percy M. Dawson
David Starr Jordan
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
ENGLAND—Harrison Brown, Fred Hankinson, Walter Walsh
CANADA—Norman Stewart Dowd
FRANCE—G. Demartial, Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Dorothy Walton
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoha
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

*"Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 15, 1928, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"*

## SPECIAL!

### *Two Features for 1929:*

(a)—Our Editor-in-Chief, Mr. Holmes, is leaving directly after New Year's for a three months' trip to Palestine, where he will deliver an address in dedication of a Public Health Center in Jerusalem. On his return he expects to visit Constantinople, Athens, Egypt and Italy. During his absence, *Mr. Holmes will contribute a weekly letter to* UNITY *describing his observations and experiences.*

(b)—Our Associate Editor, Mr. Reese, is now in India, in attendance on the 100th Anniversary celebration of the Brahmo-Somaj. He plans to return to America *via* Egypt and the Mediterranean. On this four months' trip, *Mr. Reese will write for* UNITY *a series of letters describing his experiences, especially in India.*

These are unrivalled features for the new year. Renew your subscriptions *now.* Send in new subscriptions *now.*

$3.00 Per Year

700 Oakwood Boulevard Chicago

## *Contents*

EDITORIAL—

Notes—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES and J. E. McAFEE ..... 363
Buried Alive—M. C. OTTO ..... 365
Items From a Traveler's Note-Book—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES ..... 367

ARTICLES—

Jew and Christian—LOUIS L. MANN ..... 369
Europe and the Peace Pact—HARRISON BROWN. 370
Conference of the National Federation of Religious Liberals—ROBERT DALE RICHARDSON.. 372

POETRY—

Selected—*Vachel Lindsay* ..... 363
Flames—HOMER LEWIS SHEFFER ..... 371
Injustice—KATHARINE SHEPARD ..... 371
Abraham Lincoln—ROBERT WHITAKER ..... 373

THE STUDY TABLE—

Reviews by John Haynes Holmes:
The Story of a Great Adventure ..... 374
The Case for Pontius Pilate ..... 375

THE FIELD—

The Mission of Friends ..... 375
Anna Garlin Spencer Speaks on Education.... 375

# UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME CII MONDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1929 NUMBER 23

**Would I might rouse the Lincoln in you all,**
**That which is gendered in the Wilderness**
**From lonely prairies and God's tenderness.**
**Imperial soul, star of a weedy stream,**
**Born where the ghosts of buffalos still gleam,**
**Whose spirit hoof-beats storm above his grave,**
**Above that breast of earth and prairie-fire—**
**Fire that freed the slave.**

*From "The Litany of the Heroes." In Vachel Lindsay's "Johnny Appleseed."*

---

Is Beveridge's "Abraham Lincoln, 1809-1858," which has created so enormous a sensation in the literary world, going to turn the tide of biographical manner and style which has been running so strong in recent years? This is an interesting question. Beveridge's method, as exemplified so impressively in his life of John Marshall, is purely the objective one.

> Assemble the facts, (he wrote) and all the facts, little and big, and put them in their proper relation. They tell the story far more dramatically than any fine writing or interpretation can tell it. My idea is that facts require no explanation because they explain themselves, provided, of course, that all of them are gotten and fitted together.

In pursuance of this method, Beveridge spared no effort in gathering material, and he handled this material with a skill which rates him among the great biographers of all time. Contrast this method with the subjective method followed by the writers of the Strachey school! We are told that Strachey himself, as in his "Victoria," was an untiring gatherer of facts. If so, he did not display them, like viands on a board, but devoured and assimilated them till they became a very part of his own literary nature. Other authors of this school—the fascinating Maurois, for example—show little sign of delving and grubbing. A "Disraeli" is like a piece of empty tinsel as compared with the solid structure of Beveridge's "Lincoln." These popular biographers are first and last interpreters. We see their subjects not through the clear transparent glass of recovered reality, but through the distorting lenses of the author's imagination. Maurois's Shelley is not Shelley as he was, but Shelley as Maurois thinks he was, or desires him to be. The result of these subjective studies of the great is often fascinating. But Beveridge's "Lincoln" is also absorbing.

Any believer in Prohibition who feels himself getting shaky in this matter of law enforcement may well ponder two decisions of our courts, of far-reaching significance and promise. The one is a decision of a court in Pennsylvania to the effect that a purchaser of liquor is equally involved in the violation of the law with the bootlegger with whom he does business. This decision, if sustained on appeal, as it undoubtedly will be, will make every purchaser of liquor, under conditions of regular trade and transportation, subject to arrest and prosecution, and to punishment both of fine and imprisonment. This is carrying guilt where it belongs—to the consumer who starts the illegal transaction and is thus the initial violater of the law! The second decision, in the highest court in New York State, declares the familiar speakeasy to be a "public nuisance," and thus liable to prosecution under the State penal law against such nuisances. This decision arms the local police authorities with sweeping power, simplifies court procedure, and insures convictions. At one stroke, in a state which has no enforcement law, the state authorities are clothed with greater and more sweeping power than the Federal authorities. It places the whole problem of enforcement in New York, and eventually in other states, upon an entirely new and more effective basis. Thus, little by little, is the cordon being drawn around the forces of disorder! Step by step enforcement becomes more practicable and thus more successful. Correspondingly, liquor becomes more costly, more dangerous, and more disreputable. Correspondingly, also, the "wets" rebel more savagely and yell more loudly. The netted beast never struggles so viciously and violently as when he feels the cords that bind him drawing ever tighter and more terribly about him! Personally, we have never felt quite so cheerful about the Prohibition situation as we do today. It took half a century and a civil war to destroy the minority slave power in this country. It will take much less time, and no war at all (only the steady, relentless grind of public opinion and the law) to destroy the minority liquor power.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

---

Are our American cities choking themselves to death? The sky-scraper is grand to look at from the

distance. A cluster of them present a thrilling sky line. But New York and Chicago are living in them, at least living with them. They are not all lovely. The City Club of New York has issued a pamphlet by Deems Taylor entitled, "The City That Died of Greatness." After referring to the record-breaking structures already gracing Manhattan Island, and the more prodigious monsters which are now in course of construction or definitely projected; after dilating upon the woes of traffic conditions as they now exist and querying about the results of imposing these new burdens upon already broken-down subway and other traction systems, he concludes:

> Perhaps the best thing to do, after all, would be to wait ten years, until New York is so hopelessly congested that no one can move at all. The population will then migrate in a body, and New York can be set aside by the government as a national park—the city that was so prosperous that nobody could afford to buy real estate, that was such an ideal place of business that nobody could transact any business, the metropolis so greedy for population that it choked itself to death.

Yet most American cities of any aspirations to "greatness," are following in New York's lead. Not one fails to boast of its sky-scrapers built, building, or about to be built. It has been the fond hope of some that the same automobile which speeds the suburbanite and the countryman into the city will carry a heavier and happier load of humanity out of the city into the country. But the auto has scarcely begun to function to this end as yet. Improved traction facilities have so far rather accelerated the rate of growth of cities, and have speeded the emptying of the country. There is scarcely a New Yorker except the financiers and real estate promoters who does not await with consternation the congestion which must result at the Grand Central Terminal with the filling and emptying of the new gigantic towers now begun or being completed there, one of them to break all records and take rank as the tallest building in the world. We live, but do we learn?

---

Is the Ad monster about to devour itself? It needed no Stuart Chase to convince many thoughtful Americans that the advertising fraternity had seized the community by the throat. They are selling us goods whether we want them or not. The ordinary processes of barter being too slow, the installment plan of buying has mortgaged many households for years to come. But having clawed the dear public into submission is the monster to claw its own vitals? Since cigarettes are not selling abundantly enough upon their own delicious merits, you must quit buying candy so as to be able to buy more cigarettes. Don't buy tooth paste any more; buy tooth powder. All around the ring the national advertisers of commodities serving one function heretofore represented to be vital are knocking the commodities which other advertisers have been spending fortunes to educate the public into believing also to be vital. The old cut-throat methods which brought the small competing tradesmen to their disaster are being revived on a grand scale among the massive industrial combinations. To seal this very debacle has been represented to be the real justification of the modern gigantic industrial combination. Now, are these very monsters to undo each other? But perhaps this knocking of cigarettes by candy and candy by cigarettes, this scorn of tooth-paste by tooth-powder, and *vice versa,* is only the fevered advertiser's new trick. It would not be surprising to learn that the same monster advertising combination is getting out the lurid attacks of both of the contestants. A time-honored story has it that a kindly citizen once invited the editors of two vitriolic, politically partisan sheets in his community to dinner in the attempt to heal the scandalous breach, only to have one guest appear; the same individual was editing both, luridly "cussing" himself back and forth in the assurance that the community would enjoy the fracas. Does the community of today like this sort of thing? Is the ad monster wise or foolish in this day and generation?

---

So the Democratic Party is not dead, after all! The Governor and ex-Governor of the Empire State have their heads together. Mr. Raskob has been called into conference. The mails are flooding the conferees with assurances from county and regional Democratic magnates that they are already up and about since the recent electoral unpleasantness. Hope springs eternal even in the crushed breasts. Socialists and all other minorities are notified that the Democratic Party is not only a party but is major. Indeed, it will win the congressional elections of 1930, and the presidential election of 1932 will be an overwhelming vindication of virtue which was eclipsed in the recent disaster by its own purity and the base machinations of a conscienceless enemy. The election of Hoover was a tragic delusion; it is really a theft which must take rank with that of Hayes from Tilden in 1876. The Republican Party is up to its old tricks; that is the disgraceful demonstration of the recent national election. So much for Democratic griefs and aspirations. From the point of view of those who entertain hopes of a reconstruction of American politics this rejuvenescence or recrudescence must be viewed with sadness if not with alarm. Incidentally, all must admire the credulity of a group who propose to regroom the soundly defeated

candidate of 1928 for the much more difficult campaign of 1932. Their project is at least interesting. On the other hand, thoughtful citizens will ponder the clarifying influence of this move upon the problems of Mr. Hoover. A dead opposition party would leave him at the mercy of the all too potent reactionary elements in his own party. An opposition galvanized into even a semblance of vigor will throw a wholesome fear into Republican ranks, and will permit Mr. Hoover, if he desires, to utilize the support of progressive elements in his party, and base his administration on their leadership. Let us hope that he desires. Borah is more promising than Moses.

---

Is there to be a new war of the states? There will be no armed onset of one section against another, to be sure. But an exceedingly lively war of words has, for example, been raging this long time between the people of Arizona and of California. The whole people have doubtless not been involved, for the election seems to have indicated a strong sentiment in Arizona in favor of the water power project for which California and neighboring states have been so zealously campaigning. Congress has finally and decisively acted. But this is not enough for belligerent Arizonans. They propose to carry the fight to the Federal Supreme Court. Probably they will not threaten to carry it farther than that. But the incident suggests that congestion of population and diverging economic interests may again and again test our federal system. The Atlantic seaboard supplies at the moment an illustration. The development of the New York harbor is notoriously backward. Far-seeing superstatesmen have devised an agency known as the Port Authority, a legal entity established by treaty between the sovereign states of New York and New Jersey, and ratified by the Federal Government. This has been functioning for several years, to the vast improvement of prospects for the future, and with much practical achievement already to its credit. But now enters the villain. The sovereignties which created this entity can destroy it. In mid-career, with enormous financial and construction projects actually in hand, there is serious threat that partisan politics in the New York Legislature will effect the annulment of the Port Authority. The formation of great population centers straddling arbitrarily drawn state lines has driven more than one publicist to propose re-formation of states to preserve rather than arbitrarily to divide these social units. Greater New York lies in two states. It is rapidly spreading towards a third. The same may be said of several other greater American cities. Here is field for statesmanship. The New York Port Authority has been advanced as the solution of the problem. Is it now to fail?

J. E. McAfee

---

## Buried Alive

Apparently it will not stay interred, the question of science and religion. On the slightest provocation the ostensibly deceased strides over the land in lusty arrogance. Harry Elmer Barnes reads a paper at a conference of scientists and a great many breakfasts are ruined by the morning papers. The spectre is abroad again, threatening the intellectual standing of religion and the good name of science. Peace departs from pulpit and laboratory. And just when everything was thought to be neatly arranged, with the inheritance equitably divided! It is a disconcerting situation.

Now what is really the matter? If we accept the statements we read, there is nothing at all the matter. An illusion mistaken for fact, and nothing more. Between antiquated theology and contemporary science there is indeed war, and to the death. But antiquated theology is not religion; only "little minds" mistake it for such. Religion is the response of man to the divine in the universe. Concepts of God may change in response to advance in scientific knowledge, indeed must change if religion is to be a living experience. This, however, in no way touches the divine object of religion which is forever beyond the reach of science. The two realms and the experiential approaches to them are utterly distinct, and there is the end of the matter. This is the substance of what we read.

It is the substance of what we read, but it is not the substance of fact. Religion, as conceived by the vast majority of our countrymen, is actually in violent conflict with the outlook and method of contemporary science. It is even arguable that religion is, as such, irreconcilable with science; that no matter how it may be defined it will, if it is to have any differentiating characteristic at all, be antagonistic to the spirit and content of science. At any rate, the religion preached and practiced by men and women taken as they come is refuted by what they conceptualize and employ as science. How large a percentage of them are thus divided in their allegiance cannot be determined, nor does it need to be determined. The dualism is vital, deep-going, and widespread; as long as it exists there will be periodic outbreaks between the dual commitments in

the life of individuals and in the life of groups. The conflict, being a living one, will not remain suppressed under the weight of official pronouncements, nor buried because religionists and men of science have joined in writing its epitaph. Men have a way of disregarding life and the complexity of things in order to arrive at formulations, and life and the complexity of things have a way of disregarding the formulations men arrive at.

Such being the case, why give the matter any thought? Why not trust to the survival of the fittest? After all, is any other course open to us? Is not the outcome in the lap of events? Reality plays a loaded dice. What men declare to be true will not intimidate the facts. Facts exercise the authority of veto over emotional and intellectual enactments. Science and religion are, or are not, antagonistic adventures. Their relation to each other is not created by what it is said to be. Why not let it go at that?

Two answers can be made to this question even without going into the subject thoroughly. In the first place, one may be curious to know why leaders on both sides are so anxious to have it understood that all is amicability between them. To find two groups, which have been known to be deadly enemies, loudly proclaiming their undying friendship for each other is an odd phenomenon. In the second place, perhaps the relationship between the two is not after all inevitable; perhaps it depends upon our ability or inability to bring the two attitudes into creative harmony. Should this be the case discussion might be very useful.

It is fairly clear why a more friendly spirit should show itself on the religious side. The scientific outlook is now part of social tradition. It is acquired as naturally as the language we speak. While there are thousands who are ignorant of scientific technicalities, practically no one is left untouched by the concrete achievements of science. And while the true spirit of scientific inquiry is far from common among men, the experimental method which science has developed has made its way into every field. It would therefore require a most extraordinary imagination and a unique daring—just the qualities which religious thinkers as a rule lack—for religion in the contemporary world to oppose science.

The other side of the picture is not equally clear. No doubt one reason why men of science rally to the support of religion is that their professional standpoint leaves recognized spiritual wants unsatisfied. Things are valued which science knows nothing about. These must therefore be taken care of in another way, and the other way is religion. But this is not the only reason why scientists support religion. Science has become a business. It must "sell" itself to the public. It is not only a business, but a big business, employing an army of workers and operating under a stupendous overhead expense. And like every other big business, it must be able to create and maintain a market for its product or go under. What would be more serious than a boycott from the side of religion? If there were no other reason for cultivating the friendship of religious leaders this would furnish a good one. There can be little question that this practical motive is very influential in bringing about the widespread support which the church is receiving from influential leaders in the scientific world. Possibly it may account for the warmth with which they resent every suggestion of a conflict between scientific and religious aims.

Much may be said for any movement which raises men above antagonism to a level of cooperation. And when the antagonisms are the outgrowth of deep impulses, the achievement is all the more remarkable. There is always the danger, however, that unity may be attained through ignoring, rather than facing, the elements of the conflict, so that the result is superficial, merely a way of concealing the antagonisms, instead of resolving them in a happy synthesis. The current, much-announced amity between science and religion more than suggests an artificial adjustment of this kind. Nothing could be more desirable than a fruitful union of man as an aspiring, idealistic being and as an intelligent, hardheaded being. But such a union presupposes willingness to strive for the clearest possible definitions on both sides, a willingness not conspicuous in the popular compromise which leaves the realm of the known to science and the realm of the unknown to religion. Little can be hoped for from a social arrangement which rests upon the joint refusal to clarify the issues most relevant to it. Were this encouraged confusion dissipated we should be listening to very different doctrines than are at present promulgated by both parties to the alliance. Something really significant for mankind might come of a better understanding between church and laboratory if this important problem were frankly considered. That is one reason why all who have faith in realistic idealism should feel called to counteract the influence of the Henry Fairfield Osborns who would highhandedly rule its discussion out of order. The issue should deliberately be kept alive, especially among the young who are not yet committed to keeping it suppressed. Liberalism owes a large debt to those who, like Harry Elmer Barnes, force it upon our attention. The fortunate thing is that a living problem is hard to keep down; it will periodically raise its head; and there are usually willing hands to help it to its feet. In time this problem too may be able to walk alone and with its head up, unmindful of snubs and denunciations. That would be an auspicious day.

M. C. Otto.

# Items From a Traveler's Note-Book

II

*At Cannes*

Relations between France and Italy, we have been told, are strained. One would never have dreamed that this was the case when we landed from our crack Italian ship at this picturesque French port. It was a great day for Cannes, for this was the first time that a trans-Atlantic liner had ever made this place a port of call, and the appearance of the "Vulcania" marked therefore the inauguration of regular service with New York.

The ship came to anchor in the harbor in the chill dawn of January 19th. Mists hung low over the shore, hiding the nearer hills and mountains; but as the light grew stronger the white houses of the town, climbing the terraces beyond, began to emerge clearly to the view, and far behind appeared the Alps all clad in snow which was now flushed and roseate with the morning sun. The bright blue of the Mediterranean, matched by the bright blue of the sky, combined with these other aspects of the scene to make a perfect picture.

Our ship was hardly still, before there shot out from the shore a boat loaded with journalists, photographers, and members of the official reception committee. Soon the water became lively with speed boats performing all kinds of sensational evolutions, a hydroplane flying not far away, and at last a yacht which moved slowly from stem to stern of the "Vulcania" with a jazz band playing "The Sidewalks of New York" and other characteristic American tunes. When we landed an hour later, we found an especially prepared enclosure for our reception, gaily decorated with French, Italian and American flags. The most charming feature of the building was a group of beautiful French girls who pressed upon all the new-arrivals small bunches of mimosas (a bright yellow local flower) tastefully tied with tricolor ribbons. Later, in the streets of the town, we saw similar decorations in electric lights. The French people were evidently glad to see this Italian ship!

Meanwhile, there were great doings on the "Vulvania," as we learned later from the local newspapers. An official reception, an inspection of the great new liner, and a buffet lunch in the sun-parlor forward, were turned into a kind of love-feast for Italy and France. I quote from one of the papers:

> *"Pour couronner ce petit festin special, . . . l'orchestre joua l'Hymne Italien que tous les Italiens présents écontérent la main leveé, dans l'attitude du salut fasciste. 'La Marseillaise' fib suite, et quand les derniers accords se furent tus, M. Bellecroix frit la parole pour féliciter le president de la Cosulich pour son magnifique bateau. M. Lacour remercia les dirigeants de la grande societé d'avoir choisi Cannes pour escale. . . . Après les acclamations, des toasts furent portés à santé du Président de la Republique et à S. M. le roi d'Italie."*

Yet relations between France and Italy are strained! It may be so as regards the governments with their silly diplomatic tensions and disputes, but not so as regards the people. Italians and French are glad to see one another, are eager to cooperate in interests beneficial to both, and are quick to exchange sincere assurances of goodwill. Leave the people of these two countries alone, and they would never have any trouble. Yet at this very moment, twenty-four hours after this charming "Vulcania" episode, they could be stirred to frenzy against each other by rolling drums and ringing trumpets. The problem of peace is to give the people a chance to live as they naturally want to live without interference from above. The economic motive, so obvious in this case of the "Vulvania," works as here quite as often for peace as for war. Why do not we radicals recognize this more frankly?

After hearing for several days at sea that the Briand-Kellogg Treaty was being debated by the Senate, we got no news of its ratification until we landed here, and read of its signing by President Coolidge. It was encouraging to note that the French newspapers regarded this as a great event, and gave large space to the cable despatches telling of what took place. We searched the various descriptions of the ceremony of signing at the White House for mention of Mr. S. O. Levinson and Senator Borah, but their names did not appear. This is an excellent illustration, I take it, of the bad perspectives and consequent distortions of contemporary history, for those who write this story in the years to come will link these two names with those of Calvin Coolidge and Frank B. Kellogg, and the former two will come first and not second in the linking. Meanwhile I rejoice to send home report that the significance of this great Treaty is not being ignored on this side of the water. The words of Ambassador Herrick, spoken yesterday upon his arrival at Paris, should not be missed today nor forgotten tomorrow:

"This is one of the greatest events of modern times," said the Ambassador. "I sincerely believe it points the way to the real beginning of the cherished dream of peace on earth. Feudalism, slavery and other practises inconsistent with advancing civilization have already been abolished. It will be the same in the case of war. People have realized that the shameful waste of millions of young lives is inconsistent with growth and is a needless adherence to the past. The Kellogg Pact is symbolic of this changed opinion. I have a theory that every period of evil in history is followed regularly by a period of good. I think the ratification of the Pact is heralding a new period of peace to all mankind after the dark years of the war."

I share this opinion—primarily because the Briand-Kellogg Treaty means that the people are getting the upper hand of their governments, and thus may be able to check the diplomatic and militaristic machinations of these governments by their own innate sentiments of cooperation and goodwill.

*At Monte Carlo*

A fifty-mile motor trip brought us to Monte Carlo, located in that smallest of all principalities, Monaco. Nothing could be more picturesque than this drive

along the Riviera, with the sunlit Mediterranean upon our right and the snowy Alps upon our left. At times our car would be skirting the very ocean; at other times, it would be climbing hundreds of feet up the mountain sides, whence could be seen vast panoramas of sea and land; at still other times, as at Nice, we were passing through thriving cities, busy with trade and the activities of pleasure-seekers from all quarters of the world.

More conspicuous, perhaps, than what we saw was what we did not see. What an experience, for example, to speed through miles of lovely natural scenery and see no bill-boards! Here, for some strange reason, it is not necessary to remind the motorist that he should use Socony, or that it is "time to re-tire," or that Chevrolet cars are the best. There are occasional modest placards by the roadside or stray bills upon the walls, but no hillside, or verdant pasture, or lovely turn in the road is ever hidden here, as in America, by an advertising sign as big as a house. In the same way there are no filling stations, no road-houses, no vegetable and fruit marts, no camping enclosures, to make the journey hideous. Every now and then, to be sure, we passed through some little village, and here, amid the houses and shops, were restaurants and garages and inns; but in all the open country between, the eye and mind were left free of these distractions to ponder happily upon the indescribable beauties of earth and sky. It was a mystery to us how European motorists were able to get along without filling stations (gas or food) every hundred yards or so. Is it possible that they have a skill and foresight in these matters which our American motorists do not have? Or is it that these Europeans are actually civilized to a point where beauty has some meaning in their lives? I suppose that this is an old story to many travelers, but I had never motored before in Europe, and it struck me more forcibly than any other feature of the landscape. But Americans are pouring in, and undoubtedly this soon will all be changed. Another five years, and the Riviera drive may be as unspeakably hideous as any New Jersey highway or New England turnpike!

Monte Carlo is of course the Casino, and the Casino is Monte Carlo. Located in the little principality of Monaco, the smallest independent kingdom in the world, it is to all intents and purposes the stronghold of a brigand chief. The traveler is held up from the time he pays his tax at the frontier to the time when he pays his last exorbitant tips at the hotel. The gambling spirit is in the air. It is assumed that everybody who arrives here has money to throw away, and the inhabitants act accordingly. And why not? We come here for no other imaginable purpose than to see the gaming tables, and should expect to be fleeced.

And the gaming tables are worth it! Ten were in operation there when we entered the Casino, each surrounded by rows of hard-faced, serious, silent people, with note-books and pencils, scrupulously recording every throw, and trying time after time to outguess the wheel. Roulette was, and still is, a mystery to me; but I saw enough to enlighten me as to the origin and meaning of the familiar phrases, "playing the red," "raking the money in," etc. No novice can ever forget that sight of the attendants with their long rakes gathering in the money after the little ball has decreed the gains of a few players and the losses of all the rest. What wonder that this little country is wholly supported from the income of the Casino, the citizens paying no taxes of any kind!

In two particulars, the gambling disappointed us. In the first place, my wife and I were surprised by the general character of the players. We expected to see elegant ladies, in gorgeous dresses and cloaks, adorned with precious jewels, and men faultlessly attired in evening clothes. There were a few such specimens present, but the majority were ordinary in the extreme. Evening dress was the exception rather than the rule. Many were shabby in appearance, especially a goodly number of old women in rusty black clothes who played with an intentness and precision which was almost horrifying. There they sat, these withered dames, studying the long columns of figures in their note-books, placing their chips on carefully chosen spots on the table, and losing with dreadful regularity. I watched one old woman who was as studious and careful as a graduate student taking a final exam. After each throw, she recorded the lucky number in her little book, and then placed her ten-franc piece for the next throw. I watched her for ten minutes or more, and not once did she score a "win." These people were typical. Perhaps the elegance and distinction come later in the season. At any rate, we saw a spectacle which was sorry rather than dazzling.

The second surprise was the quiet, almost the silence, of the place. No excitement, no stir, no cries, no conversation, little moving about! Players laid their wagers without comment, and took their losses or gains without a word. Only the whirling of the little ball in the wheel, and the soft calling of the attendant when betting on the play must stop, broke the oppressive silence. There was something almost uncanny about the stillness of the tables. My wife and I wanted to talk, to make inquiries of one another, but we dared not lest our voices disturb the breathless awe of the place. It was for all the world like a college examination-room, or a cathedral with groups of worshippers. The amazing thing to me was the utter stoicism of the players, which matched so perfectly the bored indifference of the attendants. Nothing apparently could disturb them. I watched one young girl place a 100-franc piece time after time upon the same spot on the table. She lost as regularly as she played. Finally, without a word, she rose, leaving her note-book to hold her place, and went into the bar and took a drink—a bracer, I suppose, for some more play at 100-francs a throw.

The thing got on my nerves. I was glad to go, as I shall be glad to leave the town this morning. I shall not come back, unless it is to see again the one really interesting and natural sight which came to my attention. It was in the afternoon, as I was strolling along the drive by the sea. A few yards away from the rocks were two fishermen in a boat. One was looking down through the clear blue water. Every now and then he would drop his line, while his companion manoeuvred the boat in obedience to the fisher's directions. Then twice, as we watched him, he lifted to the surface and tossed into his boat, a squirming squid, with its waving tentacles and ugly body. The fisher was a master of his art—his fishing was worth going miles and wasting francs to see!

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

*Monte Carlo, Monaco.*

# Jew and Christian

Suggested by the Bi-Centenary of Lessing and Mendelssohn

This season of the year marks the bi-centenary of one of the greatest of Christian Liberals, Gotthold Ephraim Lessing. The same year saw the birth of Moses Mendelssohn, a Jew. Their acquaintance ripened into a friendship similar to that of Jonathan and David, Damon and Pythias, Ruth and Naomi. Each elicited from the other the best and the noblest, and each "convicted the other of unexpected virtues." The creative faith of one in the other, inspired and influenced the character of both.

Lessing was one of the world's greatest champions of religious liberty and of absolute tolerance. His name will ever be spoken in reverence, together with other prophetic souls like Malachi, John Milton, John Locke, Jeremy Taylor, John Stuart Mill, Roger Williams, William Penn, Lord Baltimore and Thomas Jefferson.

Lessing was by nature, education and inclination a critic—dramatic, literary, art, and religious. He was a dramatist, philosopher, statesman, and thinker. He liberated German literature from its slavish dependence on French literature. He freed religion from creeds, ceremonies, and dogmatism, and released the judgment of the people from prejudice. As a mere boy of eighteen, he produced a drama called "The Jew." The plot was very simple: A Jewish traveler rescued a Christian nobleman, who, in gratitude, offers his daughter in marriage. The Jew refuses to be rewarded, with the words, "All I ask is that hereafter you will not think ill of all Jews." The nobleman responded in ecstasy, "Oh, how estimable the Jews, if all were like you," to which the Jew answered, "Oh, how estimable the Christians, if all were like you." This play from the boy Lessing, called forth the criticism that such Jews did not exist. Later, Lessing wrote another play—"Nathan the Wise"—the hero of which is an infinitely greater and nobler character, and, when the same criticism was made, as he felt sure it would be, he pointed to his friend Moses Mendelssohn.

The background of "Nathan the Wise" is most strategically woven. We are given a picture of the Crusades—religion misdirected and perverted—a veritable burlesque on Christianity. Nathan, a merchant of Jerusalem, suffered extremely, having lost his wife and seven children at the hands of those who thought they were serving him who taught love. Out of the crucible of suffering came the character of Nathan, not embittered or revengeful, but purified, and gentle, and loving. He reared a child which was given to him by a monk, with love, intelligence and compassion. A young Templar rescued this foster child, Recha, from death, and gratitude was fanned into romance. Nathan, hearing of the episode, sought the Templar, to tell him the origin of Recha, that she was a Christian and not a Jewess. The Templar, in this play the spokesman for Christianity, spurned Nathan, because he was a Jew, and did not permit him to tell the story. He consulted the Sultan, who rebuked him, saying, *"Jew and Christian are alike. How can one be a Christian at the expense of Mohammedan or Jew?"* Some time later, the Sultan summoned Nathan, and, before addressing himself to the business at hand, asked Nathan, "Which is the best religion?" Nathan begged to preface his answer with the now famous story of "The Three Rings." The story was originally found in Abraham Abulafia's work, *"Or Ha-sechel,"* "The Light of Reason," in the 13th Century. Later it was found in Boccaccio and also in *"Shebet Yehudah,"* by Solomon Ibn Vergo, a Jewish historian and physician of Spain.

The story tells of a father who had one ring and three sons. The ring carried with it the birthright. Each of the sons was dearly devoted to his father, and each of them, in his own way, persuaded the father to give him the ring. The father found that in moments of weakness, he had promised each of the sons, the ring. But there were three sons, and only one ring. The father called in an expert artisan, and told him of his predicament. The artisan volunteered to make two rings, so like unto the first that even the father could not tell them apart. In this he was successful, and the father gave each of the sons a ring—each thought it was *the* ring. Before long each knew that there were two other rings like unto his, and together they came unto the father. The father answered, "Go forth into the world, and time will tell which of you has the real ring." "By their fruits shall ye know them." The Sultan smiled with consuming interest, "But," said he, "answer my question. Which is the best religion?" Nathan said, "I have answered your question. The father is God, the sons represent Christianity, Mohammedanism, and Judaism, and the best religion is the one whose devotees act the best. Time alone will tell."

This drama contains a number of suggestions for the good-will movement between Christians and Jews that has been sponsored by noble souls in our own day. No religion has a monopoly of the vices or the virtues of civilization. Let Jew and Christian understand that nobility of character is limited to no one faith. No man's creed is wrong whose deed is right. Every religion is divine if its devotees act divinely. All religions are human—all too human—if its devotees act inhumanly. In one part of the play Nathan, after an act of generosity, is addressed by the Templar with exultation, "Nathan, you are a Christian," to which Nathan answers with a calmness that carried great conviction, *"What makes me to you a Christian, makes you to me a Jew."*

As the result of his championing an unpopular cause, Lessing died at the age of fifty-three, worn, tired, disillusioned, a martyr to the cause of tolerance. Jew and Christian must not tolerate each other, but they must have tolerance. Even tolerance is not the correct word, for it, too, comes from the Latin *tollo,* which means "to bear" or to "put up with," and what we really need is sympathy, in the original Greek sense of the word, of "feeling with" the other, not in the sense of pity, but of putting one's self in the other's

place. When two religions misunderstand one another, both are in the wrong. Lessing placed in bold relief man's inhumanity to man, when again and again in the play, occurred the sad refrain: *Thut nichts, der Jude wird verbrandt*—(it matters not, the Jew goes to the stake). He knew how the Jew had been hounded and haunted, literally hunted and harried, how he had been made the victim of false accusations of desecrating the host, of poisoning wells, of creating epidemics, and of causing plagues. He knew that the Jew had been expelled, for no reason at all, from one country after an other, from England, France, Austria, Germany and Spain. Lessing devoted his life to the vindication of Jews, not because they were Jews, but because they were the victims of injustice, and because he saw in the unjust treatment of the Jew, the bankruptcy of Christianity. He looked upon the Jew as a barometer of civilization. The world's treatment of the Jew to him spelled a challenge to Christianity, a challenge, which, if left unanswered, was an indictment, an indictment that spelled failure—failure to follow the teachings of that man, that rabbi, and that Jew whom the Christian world calls its saviour, and who, in answer to the Scribe's question as to the essentials of religion, responded, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Jews and Christians must respect one another and must also respect the differences in their religions. As all trees will never be maple trees, or all musical instruments, violins, so religions need not be the same —should not be the same. Uniformity is not good—unity, however, is essential, a unity which includes diversity. It is not necessary to file down uniqueness, to sandpaper away differences, to plane off special characteristics. As long as men will think, men will differ. Christianity alone offers more than two hundred varieties today. Differences of opinion are helpful, not harmful. Difference stimulates; indifference, disintegrates.

What difference does it make whether the Golden Rule came from the nineteenth chapter of Leviticus or from the New Testament, or from the writings of Confucius, or the Avesta, or the Upanishads, or the Koran, or the Vedas? The problem for Jew and Christian and all others is to put the Golden Rule into practice.

Lessing was a liberal. A liberal is not necessarily an extremist, a radical or a revolutionary, but one who has an open eye, and an open ear, and an open heart. He must realize that the last word has not been spoken, that revelation is not an historical event, but history itself, that neither Moses, nor Jesus, nor Buddha, nor Mohammed spell finality. A man has a right to be wrong—if he is sincere. Many will recall the famous words, "I believe you are *wrong*, but I am willing to die for your *right* to say it." We must yield the liberties we wish to enjoy. Religion is not a possession, but a quest for the good, the true, and the beautiful, which "live, and move, and have their being" in God. It was Lessing who said that if God held the absolute truth in His right hand, and the eternal quest for truth in His left, and asked him to choose, he would fall down reverently before the left hand, for the eternal quest for the truth, and say, that "the final truth, after all, is for Thee alone, oh God."

In this ideal quest, because it is the quest for the Ideal, and in this eternal quest, because it is ultimately a quest for the Eternal, Jews and Christians would find how much they have in common and how little really separates them. They would no longer continue to challenge each other, but challenge their common foes—poverty, disease, war, crime, ignorance, superstition, maladjustment, hatred, and ill-will. The arbitrary, artificial and man-made differences would soon disappear before the overwhelming God-made resemblances that would unite them one to the other. Christless Christians and Godless Jews separate Jews from Christians and Christians from Jews. When the Christian becomes a *real* Christian, and when the Jew becomes a *real* Jew, then will Lessing's vision be realized, "What makes me to you a Christian, makes you to me a Jew."

If I knew you and you knew me,
And both of us could clearly see,
And with an inner sense divine
The meaning of your heart and mine,
I think that we would differ less,
And join our hands in friendliness,
Our thoughts would pleasantly agree,
If I knew you and you knew me.

LOUIS L. MANN.

---

# Europe and the Peace Pact

It is to he hoped that the relief and welcome with which the news of the ratification of the Peace Pact has been received in Europe will go far to dissipate the suspicion aroused in the United States by the Anglo-French compromise and by the way in which the Pact itself was handled by certain reactionary European governments.

In a leading article on January 17 the London *Times* wrote that with ratification by the Senate the Pact,

"is virtually in being. It is an instrument for which there is no precedent in the records of international transactions." . . . . "The Pact is, though a novel not a visionary enterprise. In sober hope and careful reason it can and ought to be the turning point of a movement for peace which began with the Armistice and has continued—this, too, has no historical precedent—ever since. By decree of the Senate the United States has now taken its place in that movement. Without it, as the ten years of endeavor have shown, all achievement was necessarily partial and incomplete. For the first time unanimity prevails. The first step is being taken by universal agreement along the known road that leads away from the catastrophe which civilization so narrowly escaped. Abstention from force is the fundamental rule and criterion of the relationships of a civilized community." . . . . And again: "The Pact does not and cannot disinherit a nation, any more than civilized law does or could disinherit an individual, from the elementary right of self-defense. But it records and ratifies the cessation of a state of affairs in which force was a method of policy that was not necessarily held incompatible with civilized existence. The scope of the Pact is therefore as wide as civilization itself." And finally: "The most assiduous student of realities may therefore be prepared to regard the achievement associated with Mr. Kellogg's name as registering and promising a definite change in the course of world-history. In this country it is greeted with single-hearted hope and instinctive welcome. It is a conception which is wholly at

one with the purpose of our own community of States. It gives common ground on which the American and British peoples can move forward to a better understanding of each other's needs. And it has concentrated the resolution of the nations upon the true lesson of fifteen years of painful experience. It has laid down for civilization a definition of itself which it must learn or perish."

Characterising the Pact as a "long step forward on the road of civilisation," another Conservative London paper, the *Daily Telegraph,* points out that

"the future of the great enterprise initiated by the United States Government depends upon the strength of sincere and purposeful conviction with which it is supported by American public opinion. Now that the goal is won, that opinion is seen to be as settled as ever in the well-warranted belief that American statesmanship has won honor in the eyes of the world by a signal service to the greatest of causes. So long as that pride of achievement endures, the policy of the Pact will have behind it the greatest force of practical idealism that the world can show. It is that force which has carried the Pact, when all is said; but for its constant manifestation during the past twelve months, the Senate, there can be little doubt, would have maintained its conservative tradition in foreign policy, and refused to sanction what is, in fact, a revolutionary departure from the historic American attitude towards world affairs."

But the all important facts that the Peace Treaty "constitutes a landmark in international law" (to quote the letter of a London lawyer published in the *Times*) and that it changes the institutional status of war, should not be allowed to obscure the immediate effect which the Treaty can have upon current political problems.

That effect is as fundamental as it is far-reaching, the speed with which it will be manifested depends solely upon the body of public opinion placed behind the Pact in the various countries. Hitherto the solution of political problems has been dominated by the strategic effect of the proposed solutions in times of war. Strategy has very definitely formed policy, the advice of military and naval technical experts has almost of necessity been the chief concern of those entrusted with the preservation of a nation's "security." The abortive Anglo-French compromise probably had no other genesis, faced with the problem of doing something to disarm public criticism of their policy of drift and obstruction to peace the British Tory Government found themselves confronted with the technical advice that they must first propitiate France, a potential danger to Britain in terms of strategy on account of her remarkable navy and the proximity to England of her submarine bases and aerodromes. But France and Britain have now both signed the Peace Treaty. Dare either government openly distrust the pledge of its neighbor? The "threat" of French submarines against British or vice versa becomes a bluff which can only be made good at the expense of the total sacrifice of national good faith and at the certain cost of the reprobation of the whole world.

It is not merely that naval agreement between all nations becomes simple if the problem be attached on the basis of the Peace Pact, the way is thereby opened to proportional reduction of both naval and land armaments to police strength. And there again public opinion which is after all but another term for taxpayers, controls the speed with which this vitally necessary reduction will be carried out.

The potential effect of the Peace Pact in other specific problems is equally striking. Let us take, for example, that perennial scare of the Paris Press the *"Anschluss."* Germany and Austria have today a common language, a common postal and customs union, and latterly a common code of civil law. The advisability or otherwise of actual political union is hotly debated in both countries but the number of those in favor is certainly augmented by the vehemently expressed opposition to it of the French and Czechs. What is the reason for this opposition except the strategic importance of the union of the two countries if war comes again to Central Europe? Remove this fearful possibility and the matter is reduced to one of merely academic interest.

But Germany, Austria, France and Czecho-Slovakia have all adhered to the Peace Treaty. Germany and Austria have given abundant proof of their good faith during the past ten years, the Council of Ambassadors has pronounced that Germany is fulfilling the Versailles Treaty in exemplary fashion. France and Czecho-Slovakia have repeatedly declared their intention to abide by the new Peace Treaty. Are they, in any country, to begin now to say that it respects the voice of its own jingoes and war mongers rather than the voice of the people across its frontier?

From time immemorial the jingoes of the world have had carte blanche to influence their fellows, the result has been the desolation of homes and the ruination of countries until civilization itself stands today on the brink of destruction by the machines which man can invent but has not yet controlled.

The voice of those who counsel trust in the promise of their neighbors to keep the peace has never yet been listened to. Can it do worse than that other voice?

Strategy as a policy is based on a fundamental fallacy—that national rivalry is the chief factor in international relations. In the modern world the development of quick means of transportation, the interdependence of industry and commerce prove overwhelmingly that cooperation between nations must be the basic factor in international relations if civilization is to survive.

Perhaps the greatest of all the advantages conferred on humanity by the Peace Pact is that it brings our outworn political theories and systems into line with the new realization of all sections of the communities, that war can no longer be the guiding motive of political thought, and that Peace must be.

HARRISON BROWN.

---

### Flames

The transient flame upon my hearth,
Now leaping, twisting, upward bound,
With merry, gleeful, crackling sound,
Reminds me of *my* tryst with time!

HOMER LEWIS SHEFFER.

### Injustice

You who have lived know this—
That the white flame of justice
Can be blown into
The red flame of passion.

KATHARINE SHEPARD.

# Conference of the National Federation of Religious Liberals

From widely scattered communities came the Religious Liberals, who attended the Iowa City meeting of the National Federation of Religious Liberals, on January 29 and 30, 1929. Some came from Boston, a few from Illinois, and many from various towns in Iowa. All were drawn to the meetings because of their ardent faith in the working principles of liberalism applied to life.

All those who attended owe a debt of gratitude to their kind and genial hosts, Dr. and Mrs. Weatherly of the Unitarian Church of Iowa City.

The meetings opened with a Seminar for ministers led by Professor Hart of the department of Sociology in the University of Iowa on the subject of "Personality—Its Nature and Development." Seldom has the fascinating subject of personality been presented in a more thought provoking and stimulating manner, by a speaker who was at once authoritative and yet undogmatic, a rare combination. Dr. Hart defined personality as "the whole complex of traits that determine the role that the individual takes in his group," or, in others words, the sum or integration of traits. He called our attention to four main traits. (1) Those physical traits that differentiate us from groups around us, for example, the effect upon a colored person of the fact that he is a black placed in a community of whites. (2) The temperament of the person, which is the contribution of his nervous system to his personality. (3) Habits, which are composed of feelings, thoughts, actions. (4) One's philosophy of one's self.

He called our attention to the fact that we could not say we had one personality, for we were essentially different personalities in different groups, as a man may have an altogether different personality in dealing with his labor from his personality when in his family circle.

In speaking of the nature and development of personality, Dr. Hart brought out the idea that it was in the development of these traits, only present, perhaps, in form in the individual, that the personality of the individual was formed. He felt that in the process of development, an emergent dominating sum total of traits which we call the man's personality was brought into existence. How much of that personality existed at the start was a matter of question, Dr. Hart feeling that there was originally very little. He thus inclined toward the behavioristic school, but parted company from Watson in his idea of one's philosophy of one's self. Dr. Hart brought out the seeming paradox in the scientific attitude, or viewpoint. We attempt to investigate a phenomenon in a purely objective manner, and yet our knowledge of the new psychology tells us that we are indissolubly associated with the object we are attempting to investigate.

Dr. Hart as a sociologist was asked what he felt was the sociologist's idea or reaction to religion. He felt that the attitude of sociologists was neutral as sociologists, their sphere of activity being merely to describe religion as it was seen in man, and in man's reactions to his environment. But as a man, Dr. Hart felt that there was a creative element in human experience which becomes increasingly effective as it acquires knowledge of the mechanisms and processes that are involved in our own formation. All present felt that the discussion so ably conducted by Dr. Hart was most stimulating, and that men interested in religion could gain much from contacts with the findings of sociologists.

The evening meeting, held in the Unitarian Church, was presided over by Judge Roger S. Galer of Mt. Pleasant, Iowa, the president of the National Federation of Religious Liberals. The first paper was given by the Rev. Professor Sidney S. Robbins, professor of Philosophy in Lombard College, who spoke on "Philosophy's Contribution to Religion." He emphasized the fact that living as we are in an age of change, philosophy which inquires into the nature of things, can make as it has made, many contributions to religious thought. A study of philosophy shows us that a variety of causes influences religious thought, and the results in the opinion of Dr. Robbins are, a religion of nature, an ethical religion, and an inward or personal religion.

In discussing a religion of nature, he brought out the idea that in our view of nature, we may feel with Bertrand Russell that nature is a blind force that forever seeks to crush out life, or at best is not concerned with our human destiny. Or it may be viewed as a friend of man. We may feel with Wordsworth that man is a child of nature and also that man is at home in nature. Dr. Robbins also brought forth the admirable sides of nature worship, the feeling that we are in tune with nature, that contemplation helps us, and that there is an order that is greater than our human order, that gives stability to us. Then there is a side of nature worship which is not so admirable, as man is always prone in contact with nature to be submissive, when strength of character is heeded. Energy is in danger of being crippled. We need at times to be in a rebellious mood, then it is that we turn to an ethical religion. In ethical religion, religion is one with the moral law. As Dr. Robbins said, "When you feel that all is wrong with human nature, you have the beginnings of the prophetic attitude, and also of ethical religion." He traced the growth of social idealism through the Hebrew prophets to one of the great modern exponents of ethical religion, H. G. Wells. It was at this point that Dr. Robbins offered a very sane criticism of Humanism. He felt that Humanism was lacking in elements of nature religion, that it did not connect its theories sufficiently with the findings of the social psychologists, and that many Humanists seemed too confident as to exactly in what social values consist.

But Dr. Robbins did not feel that a religion of nature, or a religion of ethics as applied to groups was sufficient. Man needed an inward or personal religion. He emphasized the importance of the central point in personal religion, that God dwells within the individual. He said that God was known to many as the inner life, a particularly fruitful thought. He showed that in the personality of Jesus nature religion, ethical and personal religion found concrete expression.

A love for nature, a demand for social justice, a deep and abiding personal religion was needed in a religion that would be a religion of life. If philosophy can contribute something to a religion of life, then, it will make a very real contribution to religion. Nature religion, ethical religion, and personal religion all have their weaknesses, but together with the spirit of truth which is the spirit of philosophy, they will form a religion that will make men worthy of life.

The second address was delivered by Rabbi Mannheimer of Des Moines, Iowa, on "The Challenge That Confronts Us Liberals." It was an interesting paper which pointed out the types of prejudices that the liberal Jew had to face, and how those prejudices were united with what we know as organized Fundamentalism in Christian communities. He showed that the thought that ideas of the past were good enough for the present constituted a challenge to liberalism. In the second place, he pointed out that the various racial antipathies, in an absence of tolerance in all our human relations we were challenged. In the third place, he showed that the present insistence on reformation in morals brought about through law, liberalism was faced with a new danger. But the greatest danger of all in the speaker's mind was the tendency for liberals to think they were really liberal when in reality they had grown conservative. Faced with new problems, with new truths, we must not live in the glorious past of liberalism, but must ever seek a religion that is consistent with all the knowledge that we possess and will yet spur us on to greater efforts of discovery.

The Tuesday morning session was a business meeting. Again and again was expressed the idea and the hope that liberals who had broken with conservative Churches could be brought into relation with such an organization as the National Federation of Religious Liberals. The point of view was presented that liberals should regard the National Federation, as the Protestant Churches do the Federated Council of Churches. Definite steps for a wider proclamation of the view of liberals in religion were taken under advisement.

The afternoon seminar was led by Dr. Yoder of the Sociology faculty of the University of Iowa on "Labor Attitudes in the State of Iowa." Dr. Yoder had spent the last three years in studying at first hand the views of labor on such subjects as State and National federations of labor, the family, the Church, business, industry, company unions, class consciousness, and internationalism. In general, his conclusions were that labor in Iowa was pretty conservative, had little confidence in those who wanted to form a labor party similar to the English Labor Party, and was not hostile to the employers of labor. In fact, in general Labor thought very well of the employing class. Dr. Yoder felt that Labor took the Church for granted, and was not vitally interested in it.

The evening sessions which concluded the conference were devoted to two addresses, the first by the Rev. Charles Parker Connolly of Rockford, Illinois, who spoke on "Liberalism and the Survival of the Fittest Ideas." Dr. Connolly held that as ideas were what made men interesting, those ideas which had survived were of value because they were the result of life. Ideas show the achievement of the race. What ideas do we liberals cherish in religion? 1. An atmosphere of freedom. Some want liberty for themselves, we want it for all, and we desire that all should value it. 2. Tolerance, true tolerance is not lazy indifference. "Real tolerance consists in love of truth, and love of man each brought to perfection," he said. 3. A high regard for facts. We should insist upon facts before forming our conclusions. 4. We need reason so as to make the facts we have collected useful and meaningful. It has been said that reason and emotion are opposed, they are not, there is only an antithesis between reasonable and unreasonable emotions. 5. we revere goodness. The good man can be wise also. 6. We follow and employ love which we hold to be the energizing force. "Justice is methodized love." These six ideas are the bonds that unite us, they are worthy of our supreme allegiance.

The final speech of the conference was delivered by Dean Lee S. McCollester of Crane Theological School in Tufts College, Somerville, Mass. Dr. McCollester spoke on "The Working Faith of the Average Man." The Dean held that as there was such a difference in the faith we think we practice and the one we really do, we should try to see what elements are contained in the faith we do carry out in daily life, and through such an examination, mold our future conduct. He held that today, living in an age when moral and spiritual forces are being speeded up, we need a readjustment to nature, to the interacting currents of humanity, and to the varying needs of individuals. We must learn to look upon nature as a companion, and to trust one another. Each person is needed, for the contribution he can make. In conclusion, he told us that we must expect change in all things, especially in religion, that we must feel that practical good is more powerful than evil, that we carry within ourselves our heaven and our hell, and that we must believe in the great influence of the noble characters of history. The result will be that we will understand the origin and development of the self; that we will have a real joy in existence; that we can trust a universe or a cosmos that is calling to us, and that there is something within us that answers that call.

The conference, as a whole, paid eloquent tribute to the Grand Old Man of religious freedom, Charles William Wendte, who has so long led the forces of religious liberalism.

ROBERT DALE RICHARDSON.

---

## Abraham Lincoln

There is no name in all our country's story
So loved as his today;
No name that so unites the things of glory
With life's plain, common way.

Poor as the poorest were his days' beginnings,
The earth-floored cabin-home,
And yet—compared with his—our rich men's winnings
Are fleeting as the foam.

His was a tragedy such deeps concealing
All eyes with his grow dim;
And his a humor so sincerely healing
The whole world laughs with him.

He knew the doubter's doubt, the restless heaving
Of the swift waves of youth;
He knew the calm of faith, the strong believing
Of him who lives the truth.

So manifold his life, the great-souled Lincoln
Makes every life his own;
Therefore of all our heroes whom we think on
He has a place alone.

ROBERT WHITAKER.

# The Study Table

**Reviews by John Haynes Holmes**

### The Story of a Great Adventure

This book* is the story not of one adventure but of two. It is the story of a single life, to be sure, but in the span of this one career is the two-fold story of a man and of a business. In essence, of course, the two are one; but this one pattern is woven from a double strand.

The personal side of the book is the familiar romance of an immigrant coming to this country from a foreign land, and making his triumphant way to fame and fortune. This romance, however, has distinctive features of its own. Thus, the hero, Henry A. Dix, the father of the author, did not land upon these shores until his forty-second year. A prosperous merchant in the Russian Ukraine, happily married, with high standing in his community, he had never thought of leaving home until the persecutions of the Jews under Tsar Alexander III. made conditions "less and less easy." Mr. Dix saw trials and tribulations ahead. Furthermore, his "love for equality, for opportunity, could not be repressed. He was determined to free himself and his family from the cruel as well as stupid restrictions." So in 1892 he came to America.

His comparatively advanced age brought him face to face with exceptional difficulties. It was pretty late in the day to learn a new language, adapt oneself to new conditions, and start life all over again. But these facts were balanced by the further fact that the new arrival was not penniless; he had money to mainfain his family through the first hard years, and to set himself up in business. After some delay, he settled at Millville, New Jersey; put his capital into a dry goods store, which proved to be a failure; and then, through keen observation, shrewd insight, and sound artistic intuition, conceived an idea of manufacturing durable, tasteful and colorful dresses for women in the home, to take the place of the unsightly "wrappers" which were then all the vogue. He opened his first factory in March, 1896, and therewith started an adventure which reads like a romance. Mr. Dix became rich, influential, successful. Today, in his seventy-eighth year, he is one of the best known and most beloved Jews in America. We have read many stories of achievement by aliens who have fled lands of persecution to come to these free shores, but none which is more beautifully inspiring in terms of sheer personal romance than this of Henry Dix. And his son, Mark, sets down the tale with a filial simplicity and devotion which warm the heart!

But this book is fundamentally the record not of a man but of a business! It is the history of a manufacturing enterprise which grew from small beginnings to vast dimensions, which produced goods which captured the markets of a nation, which presented large profits to individual owners, and yet was absolutely free from the smart dealings, dishonest practises, and competitive rogueries, which have all too often been the accompaniment of commercial success in America. Throughout his entire career, Mr. Dix kept straight to the narrow path of rectitude, produced goods unrivalled for quality of material and workmanship, and won and held his business on the basis of simple worth. In a field of activity where we are told "it can't be done," Mr. Dix did it. He made up his mind at the start to succeed honorably, or not at all. More than once he faced what seemed to be failure as the price of conscience, and he stood fast by conscience. Yet he did not fail. On the contrary, he succeeded to a degree which places Henry A. Dix high in the ranks of the most successful business men of his generation.

But the great adventure was in the field of labor! This is a story which, to the best of our knowledge and belief, is unprecedented in the industrial history of the nation. Here is a manufacturing business, dealing with hundreds of operatives in factories, in which during a period of more than thirty years there has been no strike nor threat of strike. In this business, the trades union issue has never arisen, owing to the fact that "the policies adopted . . . . at the start . . . . were then, and remained ever after, well *ahead* of the demands made by the unions." Look at some of the things that were done:

> Wages were invariably higher than the prevailing union rate.
>
> The eight-hour day was established at a time when it was elsewhere unheard of.
>
> Ours was the first house in the garment industry to consider five days a week sufficient for the all-year-round schedule.
>
> No overtime work was ever permitted under any circumstances.
>
> All holidays were recognized, and no deductions in wages were made.
>
> All workers received two weeks' vacation on full pay.
>
> A profit-sharing system was established, which developed to bonuses which ran "from 10 per cent of the wages to 37½ per cent. *They were never reduced,* and were finally merged into regular weekly earnings."
>
> In all the history of the company, "no wages (have) ever been reduced;" nor have workers ever been laid off. In slack times business has gone on regardless, on the theory that the company and not the workers should stand the loss. Mr. Dix discovered years before Henry Ford that the talisman of prosperity is to keep the purchasing power of the workers unimpaired.

The climax of Mr. Dix's adventure came in 1922, when he transferred his entire business by due process of sale to his employees. The vast sensation of this event is still reverberating through the world—how the sole owner of one of the most successful manufacturing enterprises in the country voluntarily relinquished his holdings, and passed them all over to his workers. The whole story of this glorious deed, all the details of the agreement entered into between employer and employees, are here recorded in the pages of this book. These closing chapters make the volume a document of epoch-making importance.

> As I think back over father's life, writes the son, I see him making two migrations. In 1892, to America, the land of freedom and opportunity. In 1922, to an America of the Future, as he visualized that future in his transfer of the business to his employees.

What is the secret of these "migrations"? We have met Mr. Dix, and therefore know this book to be the perfect picture of the man. Ability and

*"An American Business Adventure," by Mark H. Dix. Published by Harper & Brothers. $3.

## The Field

*"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."*

### THE MISSION OF FRIENDS

Readers of UNITY will be interested in a meeting held recently at which Dr. Jesse Holmes, a member of the UNITY Fellowship, was the principal speaker. From the *Friends Intelligencer* we quote:

On First-day evening, January 13th, a unique and interesting meeting was held in Hanover Street Meeting House, Trenton, N. J. The speaker was Jesse Holmes, professor of philosophy at Swarthmore College, and his theme, "The General Belief of Friends Today."

Dr. A. W. Atkinson was the chairman, introducing Dr. Holmes, and contributing much to the atmosphere and helpfulness of the meeting. There was a capacity audience which listened with close attention throughout.

The speaker endeavored to point out the mission of Friends in interpreting modern life and in formulating ideals which shall be in accord with it. In doing this he reviewed briefly the history of evangelical religion and contrasted it with the needs of present-day existence. Friends and non-Friends alike learned much of Quakerism, and how to subject their religious views to the impartial light of science.

Not all were in accord with the speaker; some had little preparation for an address of this nature, but the numerous questions following were intelligent and keen. It was a tribute to speaker and subject alike, that they ended only when he reached for his overcoat and started for the train.

Dr. Holmes presents his views frankly, clearly, and bravely. The fact that to many, even Friends, some of these views are heresy, does not disturb him.

Pioneers in the world of thought have had this to meet in all ages, and we know that he belongs of right among them, whatever may be our own views.

### ANNA GARLIN SPENCER SPEAKS ON EDUCATION

On January 3 Mrs. Spencer talked on schools in an address before the Women's Conference of the New York Society for Ethical Culture. In *The Standard* Mrs. Spencer is reported as saying that one of her pet educational heresies is that: "Long school vacations in the summer are an almost unmitigated evil. They are a holdover from agricultural conditions when all children were required to work on the farm. The summer camp is only sometimes a satisfactory bridge over the great gap, and the play school is usually too much of a play school to meet the whole need. The Chicago University plan of dividing the year into four quarters, with duplicate classes, allowing of the entry of students at any time, and providing for one free quarter for all teachers, begins to solve the difficulty as regards advanced education; but the elementary and high school problem of the long summer closing has yet to be dealt with some appropriate way."

Another heresy is that college youth is subsidized altogether too much. The prexies are out begging all the time, and no parent pays, in fees, his proper share of the running expenses. So much is merely *given*, that the sense of responsibility on the part of the student suffers. When women, for instance, first got into the colleges, they could never cross the campus without a strained expression, and the sense of an awful obligation to justify the cost of their education. But now . . . And shall we go on piling up millions to enable increasing hordes of young people to become still more irresponsible in their outlook on life, still less social in their ideals, still less ready to endure on behalf of great and high devotions? For a third heresy the speaker offered the notion that social service of one or another suitable sort should be amply subsidized for youth, as a substitute not (as William James unhappily expressed it) for war, but for military discipline and training.

Mrs. Spencer's topic was "The Meaning of Progressive Education" and her heresies were by way of completing a plea for a progressive curriculum that should cover the whole educational period, and should be linked up consciously with social purposes—not merely a means to the development of individuality. A recent writer, she said, has set out certain characteristics as essential to progressive education. *First,* the country residential school is the proper place for it; and, as regards this, Mrs. Spencer would express even qualified approval only if the children spent the long week-end regularly at home, in order that parental contact and responsibility should not be lost. *Second,* progressive education must begin with the very young child,—in some cases it begins at two years, or even at one. *Third,* the school must be coeducational,—and so far the difficulties of residential coeducation have been avoided by not carrying the work of the progressive schools on into adolesence. *Fourth,* there must be many lines for the children to do, and to awaken and exercise creative energy; there must be lures to the imagination and the purposive life. Not that there is really any new doctrine in this: did not Comenius say that education consists not in teaching or learning this or that but in finding out what the child was meant to become? But it has taken centuries to reach the devising of methods to apply this gospel. *Fifth,* every aspect of the progressive school must be conducive to physical health. There must be no fixed seats, no rules so rigid as to involve needless strain. *Sixth,* only the most expert sort of teachers can be turned to successful account in a progressive school.

Well, said Mrs. Spencer, quoting Professor Thorndike, parents by now know at any rate that all children have an I. Q. and that they should eat spinach! Some of them know a little more. The progressive education movement has helped to familiarize us with the fact that all children are not alike, nor are they equal in powers of attainment. But almost all children, even the most backward, can learn much if rightly taught. And, of course, there can't be

---

character are distinctive features of this picture—a clear mind, boundless energy, steadfastness, fidelity, rectitude, courage. But deeper than these qualities, pervading all the personality of the man like an atmosphere, is simple goodness. Henry A. Dix makes no pretensions to virtue, is impatient of praise, lives in utter modesty and quiet but goodness radiates from him like an inner light. He loves his fellows, he can enjoy nothing by himself, he must share with others, his happiness is in seeing others happy. We have seldom read anything more touching than the closing pages of this book, with its ineffably lovely tribute to the late Mrs. Dix, and its charming disclosure of the home and family life. What Mr. Dix did, in the goodness of his heart, was to make his employees members of his family circle. Even when his business had become large, and his workers were numbered by the hundreds, they were all his "boys" and "girls," and he their father. One man, by the sheer love of his own heart, created a world of love where love is seldom seen. In a highly-competitive business, this man proved that such love can succeed beyond even the wildest dreams of avarice and cruelty. What an achievement and what a vindication of the soul!

### The Case for Pontius Pilate

This is a clever book,* nicely calculated to deceive a public ever trustful and never very sure of its Bible knowledge. We assume that the author relies upon the utterly preposterous character of his work to convey to the reader the real character of the documents here so solemnly presented as letters written by Pilate during his governorship in Judaea to his friend, Seneca in Rome. But it may be just as well to state that this is a work of fiction, having neither historical verisimilitude, psychological insight, or poetical beauty to commend it.

*"Letters of Pontius Pilate," edited by W. P. Crozier. Published by J. H. Sears and Co., Inc. $1.75.

first-class individuality without reasonably good health. The older attitude assumed that people could be very good even though very sick; now perhaps there is a tendency to think it is only necessary to be healthy in order to be good! There is a tremendous crusade against preventable disease; nobody can have "T. B." in peace any more. And the school doctors and nurses are getting to be a regular army fighting for children's health. Another thing we have learned is the function of interest in education; nothing catches on unless there is something inside to fasten it to. But even this excellent notion can be overworked and sometimes is. So also can the idea that very young children are immensely impressionable. You can spoil a child, it is said, very early—perhaps by the time it is three. Hence the progressive school's insistence on the paramount worth of its special province, the pre-adolescent age. What is not so well seen and allowed for is that very often with adolescence new elements enter in, a new churning of the mental content takes place, and even the more hopelessly unsatisfactory children, whatever their early impressions or want of them, may come out more or less right after all. The new fatalism is all wrong. It is not a true doctrine for progressive education; it smacks too much of the lunatic fringe.

Progressive education, Mrs. Spencer went on to say, has taught us that no unit of educational life should be subordinated or sacrificed to what is to come after; at least this principle is openly acknowledged as concerns the pre-school and pre-adolescent periods. But it has yet to be frankly and fully applied to the high-school age. There are very few high schools, public or private, where it is clearly recognized that this unit also should exist for its own purposes and not merely or mainly as a college preparatory. This is where the next struggle of the progressive education movement must be made, and there are already signs of the will to make it. And a struggle it will be, against the prejudices of schools, colleges and parents. The high schools must be saved from their crying weaknesses—from being mere adjuncts of the college, too imitative of the university, too elective, too superficial in their approach to a multitude of things. What is the high school really for; what is really appropriate to its age-period; what will make it a genuine unit of a balanced educational life?

If, Mrs. Spencer said, she had some millions of dollars to spend she would devote them not to colleges but to the improvement of education in the common schools of the country from the bottom up. Larger facilities are needed for the average child. Our best work perhaps has been done with the partially incompetent, no doubt because he gave so much trouble in school! And, of course, the gifted child has in this or that community been given a special chance. But only a few are either gifted or backward; meanwhile we tend to fit a strait jacket onto the average child, discouraging freedom of expression and breadth of interest. Even the bright child is liable to be absorbed (except where, as in California, for instance, a true ladder of education has been built) into uniformity and to disappear after ten. The majority of common folk ought to have the very best we can give them. Hence, the endowed or private school may or may not be serving its community in the best possible way. It is too likely to be increasing facilities of a showy but not primarily important sort so as to be able to put up an argument for increasing its fees,—and also to defer too much to the wishes of its young people in order to get parents to pay the increased fees. It is up to the progressive education movement to counteract this as far as it can. It is to be regretted profoundly that the movement should lay so much stress as it does on the private school as essential to a right education. Essential, yes, but only as a laboratory is essential to the advance of science. The endowed private school should be encouraged to conduct experiments, but to continue them only to the point where a given experiment is completed, when the results can be placed at the disposal of all schools and the laboratory school pass on to something else. Certainly we need such service, often necessarily expensive, for great experiments that belong in the main line of educational advance. Fortunately (Mrs. Spencer mentioned in particular North Central Park, Wisconsin) men of large means have here and there made such work possible, but so as eventually to pour the results into the life of their community, even handing over their endowment eventually to community control.

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

3913 Cottage Grove

Tel. Atlantic 1876

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S

4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

*Three Booklets*

Inaugurating a Series Under general title

COMMUNITY RELIGION

The following numbers have been published:

No. 1—Community Types and Programs.

No. 2—Religion Without a Church.

No. 3—Organizing the Community for Good Will.

—o—

These initial numbers are by one author, Joseph Ernest McAfee, director, Extension Service at the Community Church of New York. Other numbers in the series will follow, by other authors, all independent thinkers. New material, none published elsewhere.

—o—

Ideas which no religious leader or thinking layman can disregard, however he may agree or disagree.

—o—

All numbers in the series are uniform in size, volume and price, 5 by 7½, 32 pages; single copies, 25c; five copies of any numbers, $1.

—o—

Community Church of New York

12 Park Avenue New York City

*FEBRUARY*

Attentions to your wardrobe and home should include the cleansing and sanitation of garments and furnishings now showing the effects of Winter's soot and grime. Only by our new continuous flow process are the finest results obtained.

Schumann & Co Cleaners Dyers

PHONE DREXEL 0231 ALL DEPARTMENTS

MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS

*3960 Cottage Grove Avenue*